THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. III.] BOSTON, NOVEMBER, 1862. [No. 11.

ESSAYS ON THE TRUTHS AND ERRORS OF ORTHODOXY.

ESSAY II.

Orthodox View of Sin.

THE FALL.

IN our last number, we stated our purpose of examining the doctrines of Orthodoxy, with the desire of finding the substantial truths contained within the formal errors.

We commence with the question of sin; in other words, with the character of man in relation to Orthodoxy. The theology of the East asked, "What is God?" and commenced its theology on the specially theological side. It began with ontology, and proceeded to psychology. In this, Oriental theology followed in the path of Oriental philosophy. But Occidental theology, originating strictly with Augustine, followed the practical and experimental course of European thought; and instead of asking, "What is God?" asked instead, "What is man?"

We begin, therefore, with the great question, "What is man?" This is the radical question in practical, experimental theology; as the question, "What is God?" is the radical question in speculative theology. But we are now

concerned in the theology of experience and of life. We begin by seeking for human wants. Knowing what man is, we can next ask what he needs.

Orthodoxy answers the question, "What is man?" by saying "Man is a sinner;" and this answer has these four moments: —

1. Man was created at first righteous and good.
2. Man fell, in and with Adam, and became a sinner.
3. All now born are born totally corrupt and evil; —
4. And are utterly disabled to all good, so as not to have the power of repenting, or even of wishing to repent.

These four ideas are, —

1. First, that of THE FALL, or INHERITED EVIL.
2. Second, of NATURAL DEPRAVITY.
3. Third, of TOTAL DEPRAVITY.
4. Fourth, of INABILITY.

These points are fully stated in the following passage from the "Assembly's Confession of Faith," chap. 6: —

"1. Our first parents, being seduced by the subtlety and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin, God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit; having purposed to order it to his own glory.

"2. By this sin they fell from their original righteousness, and communion with God; and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body.

"3. They being the root of all mankind, the *guilt* of this sin was IMPUTED, and the same *death in sin, and corrupted nature*, CONVEYED, to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation.

"4. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.

"5. This corruption of nature during this life doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be, through

Christ, pardoned and mortified, yet both itself and all the motions thereof are truly and properly sin.

"6. Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law; and so made subject to death, with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal."

We assume the "Assembly's Catechism" as almost *the* standard of Orthodoxy. It was prepared with the concurrence of the best minds in England, in an age when theological discussion had sharpened all wits in that direction. Thoroughly Calvinistic, it is also a wonderfully clear and precise statement of Calvinism. Framed after long controversies, it had the advantage of all the distinctions which are made only during controversy. It is a fortress made defensible at all points; because it has been attacked so often, that all its weak places have been seen and marked. It is a masterpiece of statement.

Now, it is very easy, and what has often been done, *to stand on the outside,* and show the actual error and logical absurdity of this creed; to show that men are not by nature totally depraved, and that, if they were, this would not be guilt; that, if they have no power to repent, they are not to blame for not repenting; and that God, as a God of justice even (to say nothing of mercy, of love, of a heavenly Father), cannot condemn and punish us for a depraved nature inherited from Adam.

It is easy to say all this. But it has often been said, and with what result? Unitarians have been, by such arguments, confirmed in their Unitarianism; but the Orthodox have *not,* by such arguments, been convinced of the falsity of their creed. Let us see, then, if we cannot find some truth in this system, — some vital, experimental truth, — for

the sake of which the Orthodox cling to these immense and incredible inconsistencies. Let us take an *inside* view of Orthodoxy, and see why, being unreasonable, it yet commends itself to so many minds of the highest order of reason.

Let us begin with the substance of Orthodoxy (neglecting, at present, its form), and say, in general, that it regards human nature as being in an abnormal or diseased condition. The first thing to be done with man, according to Calvinism, is to cure him. Many systems, differing from each other in name, agree in this, that they do not believe in any such diseased condition of man. According to them, he is not to be cured, but to be educated. The Church is not a hospital, but an academy. Man needs, mainly, instruction. His purposes, in the main, are right; but he errs as to what he has to do. What he wants is precept and example.

As Orthodoxy believes man to be diseased, its object is twofold, and the truths which it employs are of two kinds. First, it seeks to convince man that he really has a dangerous disease; and then to convince him, that, by using the right means, he can be cured. It therefore constantly dwells upon two classes of truths: first, those which reveal man's sinfulness and his ruined condition; and, secondly, those which reveal the plan of saving him from this condition, — a plan which has been devised by the Almighty, and which is accomplished in Christianity. Orthodoxy dwells upon sin and salvation: these are its two pivotal doctrines.

On the other hand, all the systems which may be associated under the term "Liberal Christianity" regard man, not as in a state of disease, and needing medicine, but as in a state of health, needing diet, exercise, and favorable circumstances, in order that he may grow up a well-developed

individual. It regards sin, not as a radical disease with which all are born, but as a temporary malady to which all are liable. It does not, therefore, mainly dwell on sin and salvation, but on duty and improvement. Man's nature it regards, not as radically evil, but as radically good; and even as divine, because made by God.

Here then, in the doctrine of evil, lies the essential distinction between the two great schools of thought which have divided the Church. What is evil? and how is it to be regarded? This is, perhaps, the most radical question in Christian theology. Is evil positive, or only negative? Is it a reality, or only a form? What is it? Whence comes it? Until these questions are exhaustively discussed, there is little hope of union in theology.

I regard Orthodoxy as substantially right in its views of sin as being a deep and radical disease. Our Saviour says, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance." — "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which is lost."

But the question recurs, Is there only one kind of sin, — namely, voluntary and conscious transgression of God's law, originating with the individual himself, and in the moment of committing it, by means of his free will, which is its only seat? or is there sin which is a tendency in man's nature, something permanent, involuntary, of which he is not conscious; and which has its seat not merely in the will, but in the desires and affections. To this question, Liberal Christianity has commonly said, "No;" and Orthodoxy has said, "Yes."

And on this point I concur with Orthodoxy. Besides the sin which consists in free choice, and which is essentially transient, there is also the sin which consists in wrong desire, and which is essentially permanent, because it is a habit of the mind. If it were not so, there could be no

such thing as a bad character, and no such thing as a vicious habit.

If we attempt to analyze evil, we shall find that it may be conveniently distributed into these divisions: —

1. Physical Evil.

(*a*) Pain.
(*b*) Weakness.
(*c*) Physical disease.

2. Intellectual or Mental Evil.

(*a*) Ignorance.
(*b*) Error, or mistake.
(*c*) Sophism, or falsehood.

3. Moral Evil. Disobedience to the Moral Law.

(*a*) Ignorant and accidental, or transgression.
(*b*) Habitual disobedience, or vice.
(*c*) Wilful violation of human law; crime.
(*d*) Diseased moral state; as selfishness, bad temper, &c.

4. Spiritual Evil.

(*a*) Wilful alienation from God, or perverse choice.
(*b*) Spiritual inability.

Now, we see, that, in all these divisions of evil, — physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual, — it is found in the two forms of active and passive evil. In the latter form it is disease, and independent of the will.

Returning, then, to the Orthodox view of evil, which it is our business to examine, we find already that it has the advantage of the Liberal theology in recognizing this passive side of evil, which we may call *disease*. It is true that Orthodoxy has not yet succeeded in coming to any clearness on this question, and has not yet any firm, intel-

lectual hold of the main points of its argument. Examples of this confusion are quite common. Not to go back to the Calvinistic and Arminian controversies, which were but a revival of the Augustinian and Pelagian dispute; not to recur even to the Hopkinsian and Edwardsean discussions, — we have only to refer to the differences between new and old school theology in the Presbyterian Church; to the trial of Dr. Beecher; to the book of his son Edward; to the divergence of Andover from New Haven, and Princeton from Andover. Unsettled, because superficial, views of evil are at the roots of all these controversies.

The Fall of Man.

The first point of the doctrine of evil regards the fall.

Modern French philosophers have dwelt much on what they call the solidarity of the human race. By this they mean that two individuals are not independent of each other like two trees standing side by side, but like two buds on the same tree or bough. There is a common life-sap flowing through them all. Let the life of the tree be attacked anywhere, — in its roots, its trunk, its limbs, — and all these individual buds feel it. Yet each bud has also a life of its own, and develops its own stalk, leaves, blossom, fruit. It can be taken from its own tree, and put into another tree, and grow. So it is with separate men grafted into the great tree of mankind. No one lives to himself, nor dies to himself. If one suffers, all suffer. The life of mankind, becoming diseased, pours disease into all individual men.

Now, is there not something in this doctrine to which our instincts assent? Do not we feel it true, that we inherit not our own life merely, but that of our race? and is not this the essential truth in the doctrine of the Fall?

It is true that we fell in Adam. It is also true that we fell in every act of sin, in every weakness and folly, of any subsequent child of Adam. We are all drawn downward by every sin; we are lifted upward, too, by every act of heroic virtue, not by example only, but also by that mysterious influence, that subtile contagion, finer than any thing visible, ponderable, or tangible, — that effluence from eye, voice, tone, manner, which, according to the character which is behind, communicates an impulse of faith and courage, or an impulse of cowardice and untruth; which may be transmitted onward, forward, on every side, like the widening circles in a disturbed lake, — circles which meet and cross each other without disturbance, and whose influence may be strictly illimitable and infinite.

No doubt, sin began with the historical Adam, — the first man who lived. "Sin entered into the world, and death by sin." But still more true is it that we fell in the typical Adam, — Adam who stands for innocent, ignorant human nature before temptation; truest of all, that we *fall* in Adam, because we are, each of us, at first an Adam.

We are all in the garden; we are at first placed in paradise; and each has in himself all the four *dramatis personæ*, — Adam, Eve, the Serpent, and the Voice of God. Adam is the will, the power of choice, the masculine element, in man; Eve is the affection, the desire, the feminine element, in man; the Voice of God is the higher reason in the soul, through which Infinite Truth commands, — i.e., the higher law; and the Serpent, the lower reason in the soul, the cunning element, the sophistical understanding, which can put evil for good, and good for evil. The garden is our early innocence, where there is no struggle, no remorse, no anxiety; where goodness is not labor, but impulse. But, when we go out of the garden, we enter a life of trial, till we

reach the higher paradise, the kingdom of heaven; and then joy and duty become one again. Then —

> "Love is an unerring light;
> And joy, its own security."

From paradise, through the world, to heaven, — from Egypt, through the wilderness, to Canaan, — from innocence, through temptation, sin, repentance, faith, to regeneration, — such is the progress of man.

To me, the belief that I fell in Adam is not an opinion fraught only with sadness. This tide of life which comes pouring through me comes from ten thousand ancestors. All *their* sorrows and joys, temptations and struggles, sins and virtues, have helped to make it what it is. I am a member of a great body. I am willing to be so, — to bear the fortunes and misfortunes of my race.

It is true that I find evil tendencies in me, which I did not cause; but I know, that, for whatever part I am not the cause, I am not accountable. For this part of my life I do not dread the wrath, but rather claim the pity, of my God. My nature I find to be diseased, — not well; needing cure, and not merely food and exercise. I can, therefore, the more easily believe that God has sent me a physician, and that I shall be cured by him. I can believe in a future emancipation from these tendencies to vanity, sensuality, indolence, anger, wilfulness, impatience, obstinacy, — tendencies which are, in me, not crime, but disease; and I can see how to say with Paul, "Now, then, it is no more *I* that do it, but SIN THAT DWELLETH IN ME."

If, now, we return to the consideration of the Orthodox doctrine of the Fall, as set forth by the Westminster Assembly, we shall find it to be half true and half false. It states *truly* (chap. 6, § 1) that our first parents sinned, and also (§ 2) that by this sin they fell from their original righteousness; for this only means that the first conscious

act of disobedience by man produced alienation from God, and degeneracy of nature. This was no arbitrary punishment, but the natural consequence. The creed also says *truly* (§ 3) that this corrupted nature was conveyed to all their posterity: for this only means, that, by the laws of descent, good and evil qualities are transmitted; which all wise observers of human nature knew to be the fact. It is also *true* (§ 5) that this corrupt nature does remain (to some extent at least), even in the regenerate, in this life.

So far, so true. Sin, as disease, began with the first man, in his first sin; and has been transmitted, by physical, moral, and spiritual influences, from him to us all.

But now we find complicated with these truths other statements, which we must need regard as falsehoods. Tried either by reason or Scripture, they are palpably untrue, and are very dangerous errors.

The first error of Orthodoxy is in declaring transmitted or inherited evil to be total. It declares that our first parents "were *wholly* defiled in all faculties and parts of soul and body;" and that *we*, in consequence, "are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil." This statement is indefensible. But we shall consider this in another article, on "Total Depravity;" and only allude to it now in passing.

Another error, however, and a very important one, is to attribute the *guilt* of Adam and Eve to their descendants. This is the famous doctrine of *Imputation*, which is now rejected by all the leading schools of modern Orthodoxy. That we can be *guilty* of Adam's sin, either by imputation or in any other way, seems too absurd and immoral a statement to be now received.

But, though many intelligent Orthodox teachers and believers do now reject the imputation of Adam's sin, they admit what is just as false and just as immoral a

doctrine. They make us *guilty* for that part of sin which is *depravity* as well as for that which is *wilful.*

Whatever, either of moral good or moral evil, proceeds from our nature, and not from our will, has no character of merit or demerit. The reason is evident, and is stated by the Apostle Paul. We are only guilty for what we do ourselves; we are only meritorious for what we do ourselves: but what our nature does, *we* do not do. "Now, then, it is no more *I* that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."

Prof. Shedd, of Andover, some years ago published a very able essay (reviewed in the "Christian Examiner"), the title of which was, "Sin a Nature, and that Nature Guilt." This title is a sufficient refutation of the essay. A man could not utter a more palpable contradiction, if he said, "The sun solid, and that solid fluid;" or, "The earth black, and that black white."

There are two kinds of moral good and two kinds of moral evil, which are essentially different. The two kinds of moral good may be named *moral virtue* and *moral beauty:* the two kinds of moral evil may be named *guilt* and *depravity.* Now, so far as goodness proceeds from a beautiful nature, it is not virtuous; and, so far as sin proceeds from a depraved nature, it is not guilty. We can conceive of an angelic nature with no capacity of virtue, because incapable of guilt. We can also conceive of a nature so depraved as to be incapable of guilt, because incapable of virtue.

Now, the famous passage in Paul (Rom. v. 12–21), which is the direct scriptural foundation claimed for the doctrine of Adam's fall producing guilt in his posterity, is, in reality, a support of our view. The only other passage (1 Cor. xv. 22) where Adam is referred to declares that we all *die* in him, but by no means asserts that we *sin* in him.

The passage referred to begins thus (Rom. v. 12–18):—

Verse 12: "As by one man sin entered into the world,"—

[Paul here refers to the fact, that sin BEGAN with the first man.]

"And death by sin;"—

[By means of the sin of one man, *death* entered.]

"And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."

[Rather "death *came upon* all men, *because* all have sinned." The Vulgate has here *in quo*, "in whom;" that is, in Adam. So Augustine. But even those who, like Olshausen, contend for Augustine's views, admit that ἐφ' ᾧ here is a conjunction, equivalent to *because*, and not a relative.]

The next five verses (13, 14, 15, 16, 17) constitute a parenthesis, and refer to an objection which is not stated. Some one might say, "How could all sin, from Adam to Moses, when there was no law till Moses, and you, Paul, have said (Rom. iv. 15), that, "where there is no law, there is no transgression"?

Paul replies, that "sin is not *imputed* without law;" that is, as I think evident, it is not regarded as *guilt*. A man who sins ignorantly is not *guilty;* but he *suffers* the consequences of his sin, which are depravity of his nature, or moral death. "Sin is not imputed," says Paul; "but death reigns." Those who do not sin "after the similitude of Adam's transgression,"—that is, who do not violate a positive command,—nevertheless are depraved morally, and are dead spiritually. The Hottentots and Fejee-Islanders violate no positive law given them by God, and consequently are not guilty of that; but, because they violate (even ignorantly) the laws of their moral nature, they are depraved morally.

We see, then, that Paul distinctly recognizes the distinction made above between *sin as guilt*, and *sin as depravity*.

He distinguishes between sin as sinfulness or unconscious transgression (ἡ ἁμαρτία), and sin as conscious transgression, of a known command (παράβασις).

The consequence of the first is death, or moral and spiritual depravity: the consequence of the second is condemnation, or a sense of guilt.

Sinfulness, bringing with it depravity (the general demoralization of human nature), began with Adam. All became involved in sinfulness; and, consequently, all partook of the depravity which belongs to it as its wages.

It should, however, be observed, that it is not the purpose of Paul to teach any thing about Adam. His object is to teach something about Christ. He refers to Adam's case as something they all are acquainted with: he compares Christ's case with it both by contrast and resemblance. His object, however, is, not to instruct us about Adam, but about Christ. He uses Adam as an example to illustrate his doctrine about Christ. Through Christ, goodness and happiness were to come into the world. He illustrated this fact, and made it appear probable, by the fact which they already knew, — that, through Adam, sin and death had entered the world. If it seemed strange, in an age in which men were so disunited, that one man should be the medium of communicating goodness to the whole human race, they might remember that Adam also had been the medium of introducing sin to the whole human race. If the Jews wondered that Christ should bring salvation to those who were not under the law, they might remember that Adam had brought death to those not under the law, and who did not sin as he did. If they doubted how Christ's goodness could help to make men

righteous, they might remember, that, in some way, Adam's transgression had helped to make men sinners. Yet, after all, the main fact which he states is in the twelfth verse, chapter five, — "that by one man sin *entered into* the world, and death by sin." This amounts to saying that sin *began* with Adam. Then he adds in the same verse, "that death has passed upon all men, *because all have sinned.*" He therefore distinctly declares that every man is punished for his own sin, and not for the sin of Adam.

The Apostle Paul, therefore, does not, by any means, teach Calvinism. The Catechism says, that, "our first parents being the root of all mankind, the guilt of their sin was imputed to all their posterity." But Paul says, "So death passed upon all men, because all have sinned." The Catechism says that "this same death in sin, and corrupted nature, being conveyed to their posterity, makes us utterly indisposed and opposite to all good;" and that "from this original corruption do proceed all actual transgressions."

But, if this is so, there has been no such thing in the world as guilt since Adam fell. If all actual transgressions proceed from original corruption, and original corruption came from the first transgression of Adam, it logically follows that there has been but one sin committed in the world since it was made; namely, the sin of Adam. All other sins have been pure misfortunes: his alone was guilt. His transgression alone came from a free choice: all others have come from an involuntary necessity of nature.

Nothing can be more certain from reason and Scripture than this, — that transgressions which come from a corrupt nature are just so far done in us, and not done by us. This the apostle distinctly affirms when he says (chap. vii. 17), "Now, then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwell-

eth in me." No man is responsible for disease, when he has not brought that disease on himself, but inherited it from his ancestors. The disease may make him very odious, very disagreeable, but cannot make him blamable. Therefore, when Calvin says that hereditary depravity "renders us obnoxious to the divine wrath," he utters an absurdity. This confusion of ideas runs through all Orthodox statements on the subject; and the only cure is, that they should learn how to make this distinction between natural evil and moral evil, or the evil which proceeds from a corrupt nature and the evil which comes from a free will.

If I were to sum up the doctrine of the Apostle Paul on this subject, it would be thus: —

1. The first man, Adam, consisted, as we all consist, of nature and will. His nature consisted of innocent tendencies and appetites. None were excessive; all were well balanced. His nature inclined him no more to evil than to good, but each faculty was in proper poise. The first sin, therefore, could not have been a gross one; it was a simple transgression: but its effect was to introduce what the apostle calls *death;* that is, a diseased or corrupt nature. The process is this: With the first conscious and free transgression, there arises a sense of guilt. This sense of guilt leads the soul away from God. Adam and Eve hide in the garden. Every act of sin tends to create a habit, and so destroys the moral equipoise. There hence arises a tendency *toward* evil, and *from* good; and this is called death, because it takes us away from God, who is the source of life.

2. A tendency toward evil is thus introduced into the world by the transgression of the first man. His descendants are now born with a nature which is not in equipoise, but which leans more toward evil than toward good. Their will remains free as before; but they cannot perform the

same amount of good as before. These corrupt tendencies tempt to greater sin than the pure tendencies did, and, whenever yielded to, bring a greater amount of moral evil into the race.

3. Things, therefore, are thus growing worse continually; for every new act of sin makes it easier to sin again. And this tendency to death, or estrangement from God, must go on increasing, unless some antagonist principle can be communicated to the race. This is actually done by Jesus Christ. The principle of life which Christ introduces consists in reconciliation to God. Sin separates us from God, and therefore tends to death. Christ reconciles us to God, and so is life. The way in which Christ reconciles us to God is by manifesting God's pardoning and saving love to the sinful soul. In his own life, but especially by his death, he communicates this pardoning love, and so produces the atonement. This is the central, Pauline view of the relation of Adam and Christ to the race. Adam introduces death into the world: Christ introduces life. He does not speak at all of *imputation*, or transfer of guilt; but he speaks of an *actual communication* of death and life. Adam and Christ both stand in actual, and not merely ideal, connection with the whole race of man. Adam is a living soul; Christ, a life-giving spirit. By inheritance, we receive a depraved life of the soul from Adam; by communion, we receive an eternal or spiritual life from Christ. And, in regard to both of these acts, the notion of blame or merit is entirely excluded. We are not to blame for our inherited depravity derived from Adam. We deserve no credit for the salvation which comes to us from Christ. The compensation for the misfortune of inherited evil is the free gift of divine goodness in Jesus.

We have thus considered the truth and the error contained in the Orthodox doctrine of the Fall. The truth of

it is in its assertion of a depravity of nature, to which we are liable in consequence of ancestral sins: the error is in imputing guilt to us in consequence of them. We shall consider, hereafter, the Orthodox doctrine of Depravity, in order, in like manner, to separate its truth from its error.

THE GOVERNMENTAL THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, WITH AN ILLUSTRATION,

BY A. LINCOLN, D.D.

Jesus presented God as our heavenly Father, and his favorite title for the Supreme One is plainly suggestive of clemency: yet many of our Orthodox brethren prefer to consider God chiefly as a sovereign Ruler, whose government, to be respected, must be firm and strict; guarding carefully against the consequences of permitting crimes, even when repented of, to go unpunished. The majesty of the law is said to require that magistrates shall not bear the sword in vain, but make themselves a terror to evil-doers. "If it is known, that, owing to leniency, great crimes will be overlooked, and guilty offenders forgiven, there will be no end of public disorder."

So far as it relates to *human* governments, this is all very true. The actions of courts are in the sight of the world: their proceedings are read and known by all men. Judges who shrink from inflicting adequate punishment upon convicted villains are apostles of anarchy, and teachers of treason. Governors who, yielding weakly to artful importunities, turn loose upon society those who will prove its worst pests, deserve something besides pardon for themselves. It will never do for men intrusted with our public interests to give heed to ordinary professions of penitence

and amendment. Of course, rogues are sorry after they are caught: but we cannot know that they have become good men; and, so long as there is the least doubt of their reformation, they must not be allowed to go free.

Still, let us mark two distinctions between human and divine governments.

1. God's dealings with the souls of individual men are mainly secret and unknown. When weighing our personal relations to him, his tribunal usually sits with closed doors, and others do not witness our rewards or punishments. Some sins, to be sure, have outward and visible consequences: but many have only hidden results; and, where the consequences are known, they are often so superficial as scarcely to merit consideration. Every guilty heart knoweth its own bitterness. When suffering from remorse, I feel the gnawings of a worm that your eye cannot see; I hear the upbraidings of a voice that your ear cannot hear. Through this privacy of the records of the spirit, God can forgive or punish individuals according to the peculiar circumstances of each case, without feeling that the general reputation of his government is necessarily at stake.

2. God can discriminate between genuine and spurious repentances: and therefore no dishonor can come upon his government, even if instances of forgiveness are known; for they will be seen to be the decrees of wisdom no less than of love.

If human rulers were omniscient, looking at the most secret workings of the heart, unerring in their estimate of motives, they would be warranted in a liberal use of the pardoning power. We might shrink at first from admitting the truth, but it *is* a truth, that society is in no danger of harm at the hands of a truly and thoroughly reformed person. If an all-wise Being declares a penitence sincere,

we should not demand an hour more of suffering that has become needless for amendment. Let proud, impenitent wrong-doers feel the heavy weight of Retribution's hand; but, even for injuries to us and ours, we would never have smoking flax quenched nor a bruised reed broken.

Earthly rulers are so weak and blind, that their attempts at pardoning are generally serious if not criminal blunders; but now and then there is an approach to an illustration of the way in which God can freely forgive, without impairing the security and honor of his government. The merest tyro in military affairs is aware, that, if sentinels are allowed to slumber at their posts with impunity, the army, whose guardians they assume to be, are wholly at the mercy of the foe. If there is any offence that requires such treatment as will make men thoughtful and vigilant, it is the one now cited. This was felt deeply at the beginning of the present war, when a New-England soldier was found guilty of the act. The sentence of death was announced; and we had to stifle our regrets with the plea of military necessity. We considered it expedient that one man should die, that the entire army might not perish. The time for the execution drew near: already it threw its awful shadow over every heart of flesh that beat in a loyal bosom. The President had slight reason to interpose: he knew the imperative need of strict discipline. He attended a church, where, every Sunday, there was allusion to the need of honoring a broken law, vindicating authority, and satisfying glorious justice; but in the silence of the White House, to the man bewildered by cares of state, came a divine voice, and whispered, "It is safe to forgive." The chief-magistrate of a great nation arose, and, unwilling to trust his mission to an inferior hand, through darkness and storm, over a long and rough and wearisome road, he went himself, to make sure of the

pardon. Did it result in a contempt for authority, and disregard of the broken law? By no means. Many a statesman and many a general have slumbered since; but we have ceased to hear of common soldiers asleep at their posts. Did mercy harm the forgiven man? We are told that he died nobly on the battle-field, and his last breath was in prayer for the President! Long after this Administration ends in popular approval or reproach, — when our party-names shall be forgotten, and our civil war hardly remembered as an event of the remote past, — in distant lands, hearts will throb, and eyes will glisten, whenever men shall hear the story of that midnight ride of Abraham Lincoln.

NOTES ON THE BIBLE.

We propose to devote a few pages each month, for a few months, to a statement respecting the construction and contents of the Bible. We do not propose to write a commentary on it, but merely to give some account of the book itself. There is much ignorance on the subject, which has been perverted into error by the traditions and superstitions of men. The present generation are not so much to be blamed as pitied for this state of things. We fear that religious teachers often attempt to dispose of the whole subject in a sermon of twenty minutes' or half an hour's length, made up principally of denials of the correctness of the popular view of the Bible, but giving no clear and definite idea of what the Bible is. We are not disposed, therefore, to rebuke the false opinions which exist, of superstitious respect on the one hand, and supercilious disregard on the other; but would the rather do what we can to aid the honest inquirer to a correct appreciation of the sacred book.

There are some facts which are not disputed by any, except those, perhaps, who deny their own personality and the existence of the external world and its inhabitants. These facts we propose to state. It is due to candor and to the community to publish just what the truth is respecting the Bible. If there is any thing which is offensive to men and women of sense, it is to be told that it is dangerous to state just what the truth is; and, if there is any thing which promotes unbelief and repels faith, it is proclaiming that there are sad mistakes respecting the Bible, but not to be spoken of, lest men should deny it.

The world is not made better by being cheated. Pious frauds are as knavish as any other frauds, and more harmful; for by and by the deception will be found out, and all confidence will be lost in those who ought to have been true enough to be worthy of being trusted. Then the reckless, the superficial, rush forth; point out not only the errors, but the hypocrisy, of those who have instructed the people; and lead astray in another direction those who ought to have been wisely instructed at first.

We believe, therefore, that we not only meet a want which is felt by many minds, but also discharge a duty which the Bible demands of us, when we state its true contents and history, with such hints as our main object permits and justifies. We apply ourselves to our work, therefore, feeling that we have said enough to vindicate the necessity of the discussion of the subject before us.

I. — *Divisions of the Bible.*

As the Bible is commonly used, it consists of *two* large divisions, — the Old Testament and the New. In many Bibles, there is another collection of books, making a third division, called "The Apocrypha;" so that in some Bibles, especially family Bibles, *three* divisions are found. The

Bible is not, therefore, *one* book, but is composed of two, or sometimes three collections, or divisions of books; for each of these divisions is made up of separate books, or pamphlets as we should call them, varying in size from sixty-six chapters to thirteen verses, — from forty or fifty pages to less than half a page.

The Old Testament is composed of *thirty-nine* of these small books or pamphlets, the New Testament of *twenty-seven*, and the Apocrypha of *eleven*, — making seventy-seven in all; or, omitting the Apocrypha, *sixty-six* in our common Bibles. This fact must be distinctly borne in mind by those who would understand the book. If each one of these books was bound separately, the common reader would, in some respects, be less likely to be led astray than he now is.

II. — *Contents and Arrangement of the Book.*

1. Let us now look at the Old Testament, and inquire what its contents are. Open it, and the inquirer will find that it is a collection of writings containing the laws of the Jewish people, their history and literature. These three divisions are nearly accurate. The laws are contained in the first *five* books, hence called the "Pentateuch" (or "five books"), and the "Books of Moses." The history is contained in twelve books, succeeding the laws; and comes down to about 400 B.C., including the books from Joshua to Esther. The literature is collected in the remaining twenty-two books, — from Job to Malachi, inclusive.

2. The Apocrypha contains the history and literature of the nation, of a later date, mostly, than that in the Old Testament.

3. The New Testament contains the revelation by Christ, the Christian law, or the Gospel, in the first *four* books, which are brief notices of the life and teachings of Jesus;

an historical sketch of Christianity for about thirty years, in the book of the Acts of the Apostles; and a collection of the literature of the Church during about the same period, consisting of twenty-one letters of the apostles and others, and the book of the Revelation.

It will be seen that there is a striking similarity in the contents, and also arrangement as it is in our English Bible, between the Old Testament and the New; the fundamental law of the Jewish and the Christian religions coming first, the history following, and then the literature.

The contents of these divisions of the Bible are easily understood, and as easily remembered. It should not be supposed, however, that this arrangement is an essential thing, or that there is any special providence indicated by it. The books are differently arranged in different languages and in different ages; the laws, however, in all cases, coming first. But the other books are placed differently in different countries and different editions. Let this be borne distinctly in mind. The arrangement of the books in our English Bibles is such as to be easily remembered, and is harmonious. But it is not the work of God: it is the work of man, as much as the printing and binding.

We will state the arrangement of books of the Old Testament in the Hebrew Bible. As far as the end of the Second Book of Kings, the arrangement is like ours; except that the Book of Ruth is placed further on, after the Psalms. After Second Kings come the Prophets, from Isaiah to Malachi, excepting Daniel; then follow the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Solomon's Song, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the two Books of Chronicles. Let this instance of diversity of arrangement suffice to show that the order of the books in the Bible has no relation to their credibility or age. They seem to have been arranged sometimes with reference to the subject of

the book, as in our Bible. At other times, they appear to be arranged with reference to their age; the oldest being put first, and the others following in chronological order. The important thing, however, which is to be borne constantly in mind, is, that the order in which the books stand has no authority, and does not indicate the relative age of the books; as the placing of Romans before the other letters of Paul does not show that it was written first, or that it was believed to be written first by the compiler. The contents of the book itself are not in the least affected by its position or place in the collection. In some of the early collections of the four Gospels, or sketches of the life of Christ, the Gospel of John is placed first; showing that the order of the books is accidental, not essential to their truth.

III. — *The Chapters and Verses.*

We have thus far spoken of the large divisions of the Bible; of the books, so called, of which it is composed; and of their arrangement. There are smaller divisions which now demand our notice, — the divisions into chapters and verses. These were made in modern times, by men who edited the Bible. About six hundred years ago, Cardinal Hugo divided the whole Bible into chapters; and, about three hundred years after, the chapters were broken, or, as Locke says, "crumbled," into verses. Robert Stephens is said by his son Henry to have made the division into verses which now stands in our Bible, while on a journey from Paris to Lyons in France, about three hundred years ago. These chapters and verses are very convenient for reference; and, though very badly made, it would hardly be possible now to change them, as all our concordances and sacred literature refer to them. But it is not necessary that the *manner* of printing these chapters and verses

should be continued. Much of the perplexity in reading which arises from these very bad divisions, in some cases, would be avoided by printing the Bible in paragraphs and sections as the subject and sense require, placing the numbers of the present chapters and verses on the margin.

We have said that some of these divisions are very badly made. The twenty-first chapter of the Acts closes with a comma and the word "saying;" what is said commences the next chapter: and verses innumerable close with some shorter mark than a period. The division into verses misleads readers. It is supposed that a verse is a full sentence; that it contains a full and completed thought. A great mistake. These divisions are all of them the work of modern times. The writers of the books made no such divisions. Paul and the rest wrote their letters as we write ours, — right on, without chapters and verses.

It is a cause of gratitude that the Bible is now often printed without these arbitrary divisions made in the text. But the great publishers of the Bible — the Bible societies — have not yet made any reform. Like the Chinese artists, they work with their hands, not with their brains; by the pattern, not by the truth; repeating the deforming flaw in every vase they mould.

THE AUTUMNAL CONVENTION.

The Twenty-first Autumnal Convention of Unitarians was held at Brooklyn, N.Y., Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, Oct. 14, 15, and 16.

In attendance, spirit, point, and quality of speaking, this Convention ranks among the very foremost ever held by

our body; if, indeed, it has ever been excelled in these particulars. Our Brooklyn friends exceeded, if possible, their well-substantiated reputation for elegant hospitality; and no element was wanting to render the occasion — what, as we have already intimated, it proved — a decided and gratifying success.

VESPER SERVICE.

The fitting initial service was the observance of *Vespers* at the new chapel (Rev. Mr. Staples's); which took place Tuesday evening, at six and a half o'clock. This beautiful service, occurring on the spot where the service, as a feature in our worship, had its first trial, under Mr. Longfellow's superintendence, was extremely pleasing. The chapel, with its peculiar architectural adornment, the arrangement of the organ and choir, and its general artistics effects, seems especially adapted to the service. The unexpected presence of Mr. Longfellow (just returned from Europe), who, jointly with the present pastor, Mr. Staples, conducted the exercises, enhanced the interest of the occasion.

MR. EVERETT'S SERMON.

After vespers, the congregation re-assembled in the Church of the Messiah (Rev. Dr. Farley's) to listen to a sermon by Rev. C. C. Everett, of Bangor, Me. The text was from Matt. xi. 19: "The Son of man came eating and drinking; and they say, Behold a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!"

The aim of the sermon was to illustrate how the actual coming of Christ exceeded the anticipations of even his friends in its magnitude and blessedness, as his daily coming now exceeds even the hopes of his followers and believers of to-day. Ever the realization is grander

and more comprehensive than the promise or anticipation. The Jews would have been satisfied had the Messiah delivered their *nation* from political thrall: his real mission was the salvation of the *world* from the bondage of sin. From that day to this, the world has been ready to rest short of the divine purpose; to sit down contentedly under a minor or inferior seeming good, rather than to reach aspiringly forward to the complete and perfect blessing which God is always holding out for our acceptance. Indeed, it is through the crushing of our cherished *wishes* that our real *wants* are met. It would be vain to attempt to give the *words* of the preacher, unless we could quote the sermon in *full;* from which our space precludes us.

The same plea must be our apology for presenting abstracts (always brief, in some instances extremely meagre) of the succeeding exercises. Our purpose in this report will be accomplished if we succeed in presenting a sort of "bird's-eye view" of the Convention; condensing, so far as we may be able, its spirit; indicating its general drift; and summing up its results, so far as it had tangible results, in the form of impressions upon those who attended its several exercises.

CONFERENCE MEETING.

The conference and prayer meeting held on Wednesday morning at Dr. Farley's Church was opened with prayer and remarks by Rev. Francis Tiffany, of Springfield. Remarks were also made by Rev. Messrs. Dall, Collyer, Stacy, and Capen, and prayer by Dr. Palfrey.

Neither this meeting nor that on Thursday morning came up to our usual May-morning meetings, in devotional spirit, or elevation of thought. This may be attributed to that fault of "much speaking," so difficult of cure. It is the rapid succession of brief, pointed, unstudied utterances

of personal experiences, anticipations, hopes, fears, which generates that glow of religious feeling by which alone these meetings are rendered profitable.

CONVENTION.

At nine o'clock, the Convention formally convened; called to order by the Chairman of the Committee, Rev. N. A. Staples, who presented, and the Convention elected, the following list of officers: —

President. — Rev. Dr. FARLEY of Brooklyn.
Vice-Presidents. — RICHARD WARREN and J. L. LORD, Esqs.
Secretaries. — Rev. RUSH SHIPPEN, Worcester; Rev. J. L. LIVERMORE, Lexington.

After a few remarks by the President, the first exercise was the delivery of an Address on the War, by Rev. Dr. Bellows, whose official position as President of the Sanitary Commission gave him unusual facilities for observation. He prefaced his address, which occupied nearly an hour in the delivery, with a few remarks relative to Rev. T. S. King, and his labors in San Francisco; reading to the audience a telegram just received from San Francisco, conveying intelligence that a second *hundred thousand dollars* was forwarded for the use of the Sanitary Commission. This piece of intelligence was received with a hearty burst of applause.

DR. BELLOWS'S ADDRESS.

It would be gross injustice to Dr. Bellows to attempt to present any abstract of an address which depended so largely for its interest and value upon its detail and fulness of statement. Its heads were, the Southern Character, Southern Resources, Origin of the Rebellion, the Interests at Stake, Character of the War, the Antislavery Element, Slavery the Chief Strength of the Rebels, the

South not Incapable, Necessity of Emancipation, Mr. Lincoln, Our Errors, What the War is Doing.

Much of interest and suggestion was said under each of these heads. The conclusion to which a review of the facts and conditions of the case leads is, that the only safe and abiding, if not the only possible, ground upon which the struggle can terminate, is the effectual uprooting of the entire institution of slavery; and to this result all events tend, and even our mistakes, errors, and defeats conspire. The final words, concerning the duties of Unitarians in the crisis and the effects of the war upon our faith, are too pertinent to be omitted; and we quote a few sentences: —

"I believe the war is doing more for our principles and faith than we can possibly do for the war. It is making Christian sects known to each other; showing what is tare and stubble, and which is gold and adamant. The intellectual and moral discipline of our Unitarian people is telling everywhere. Our chaplains, our officers, our men, have shone like stars in heaven. The principles of the war, on the legal side, are Unitarian principles. Unity, unanimity, liberty, are the common watchwords of our faith and of our cause. . . . But, if we wish to be prepared to take advantage of the glorious opening which Providence is making for us, we must begin to give more method and form to our faith and our discipline. The people are learning, in their experience of the government and of the army, the necessity of more body and form in all the great interests of life. They will be vastly more careful of organization in all their concerns, after they come to consider what their strength and what their weakness has proved in the war. If we wish to take our proper place in the Unitarian world, to occupy the room our general principles and opinions entitle us to hold, we must become more firmly knit in our joints, more orderly in our form, more distinctly visible and palpable in our being. For one, I am content to stop, — to attempt to go no further in our theological opinions.

"I think we have now liberality enough and light enough for ourselves and our children's children. I am willing to stereotype the future for a century, for the sake of spreading the spiritual views and opinions already conquered by our faith over the world. I don't pretend that this is being faithful to the principle of boundless progress. I simply propose, for the purpose of raising the general level of Christendom, to organize the light and liberty we have for the use of the world, and, after a half-century of pioneering, to have a century of settling the country, and spreading the views and opinions we hold; and, to this end, let us have organization, discipline, method, and whatever other apparatus experience has proved to be necessary to the popularization and propagation of a faith and a cultus."

We also quote a few of the opening sentences, to explain some remarks which followed at the Convention and at the collation: —

"No candid mind will deny the peculiar charm of Southern young men at college, or Southern young women in society. How far race and climate, independent of servile institutions, may have produced the Southern chivalric spirit and manners, I will not here consider; but one might as well deny the small feet and hands of that people, as deny a certain inbred habit of command, a contempt of life in defence of honor or class, a talent for political life, and an easy control of inferiors. Nor is this merely an external and flashy heroism: it is real. It showed itself in Congress, early and always, by the courage, eloquence, skill, and success with which it controlled majorities. It showed itself in the social life of Washington, by the grace, fascination, and ease, the free and charming hospitality, by which it governed society. It now shows itself in England and France by the success with which it manages the courts and the circles of literature and fashion in both countries."

DISCUSSION.

After the close of Dr. Bellows's address, the question for discussion was stated to be, "How can our denomination most effectually serve the Country in this hour of her

peril and trial?" The discussion was carried on with great earnestness by Messrs. Mumford, Dall, Tiffany, Lothrop, Osgood, Conway, A. A. Low of Brooklyn, Dr. Hall, Collyer, Towne, Shippen, and Mayo. The discussion was conducted under the ten-minutes' rule, though the Convention readily granted indulgence of longer period.

Mr. Mumford spoke heartily and earnestly in approval of Dr. Bellows's sermon. The speaker was a Southerner, and thanked Dr. Bellows for his kind appreciation of the good traits of Southern character. He thought that the Unitarian Church should maintain its principles of Christian liberality. The South needed Unitarianism; and, had its principles prevailed there, slavery and this war could not have existed. Until eighteen years old, the speaker was a firm believer in the justice of Southern slavery, but now believed it to be an outrage against revelation. He thought, from the plenary interpretation of the Scriptures, the Southerners honestly drew their belief, that their system of domestic slavery was ordained of God.

Dr. Lothrop objected to the denominational exclusiveness of the Unitarian as regarded other Christian sects. He could say nothing as to what "our denomination" ought to do about the war, but *could* say what he would do as a man, a citizen, and a Christian; and he urged that discussion should be carried on on a broader than mere denominational basis. The principal qualities ever demanded of us as Christians are now especially demanded as citizens; and the first of these qualities is courage, both mental and physical.

Dr. Osgood thought the Church of America should hold the South arraigned before the tribunal of God and humanity for having committed a great crime, — the satanic and devilish crime of human slavery. Nor is their

crime the less because covered with a sophistical theology. We are sadly disappointed in our great men. Our politicians have no character, but are India-rubber. We choose public men merely to have those who pander to our vanity. The rebel power, however, elevates to its highest places its greatest men. There is probably no nation in the world so miserably governed as ours; although the instinct of the people, like the bee who only could distinguish between the real and the wax rose, lit on a genuine man for President, and not on certain other artificial flowers. The speaker thought Banks and Butler, the greatest men Massachusetts has produced in the crisis, should be in the Cabinet.

Mr. Conway gave some reminiscences of Southern life. He said that Stonewall Jackson, so noted for dash and fire, was regarded before the war, by his neighbors, as an abstract scholar, as a godly, pious man, whose voice was as low as a zephyr, and never was seen in a passion; was, in fact, a quiet ascetic. Yet such was the man, who, under the influence of a great idea, sprung into greatness. When we are alive to the necessity of letting men fired with an idea go on fighting on our side, we will have Stonewall Jacksons, and not till then.

A few days before Mr. Conway's father's slaves all left him, he wrote North to say they would never run away. Yet old slaves, past work, who had been treated all their lives with the utmost kindness, came and said to him, "We have lived slaves all our days; been well treated: but we can die happier, if we can totter along, and die freemen in the District of Columbia."

Mr. Collyer delivered a most stirring address, urging the earnest pushing forward of the war. He had a boy in the army, who, just before the battle of Shiloh, said to his comrade, "Now, dear Hal, I love you, and you love me.

I've never been in battle; and I shall be afraid. If you see me flinch, talk to me; remind me of my mother's feelings, should her son prove a coward; and if I don't recover then, and still shrink back or show the white feather, *shoot me by your side.*"

The speaker stated that he had always been a peace man. Before Sumter, he could have found five hundred texts in the Bible in favor of peace; but, after Sumter, he looked for a text for the next Sunday's use, and could only find this one: "Jesus said, Let him that hath no sword sell his garment to buy one."

Mr. TOWNE, in an earnest address, took exception to that portion of Dr. Bellows's address which praised the Southerners, and to the general tone of previous speakers, who seemed anxious to prove that the South was a nation of gentlemen, and the war would increase our respect for them.

Mr. SHIPPEN proposed that Dr. Bellows's address be published and distributed as the voice of the Unitarian Church on the great question of the day. He compared our nation to a ship, delayed on her ways by the block of slavery, which the emancipation proclamation had knocked away, leaving the noble ship free to make her grand voyage.

COLLATION.

About two o'clock, the Convention adjourned to partake of a collation at the Academy of Music. The company passed from the church to the anteroom of the Academy, and spent a delightful hour in social intercourse. At three o'clock, the doors of the auditorium were thrown open, and the company, numbering six or seven hundred, entered. The entire parquet was floored over level with the stage; and tables extended from the dress-circle to the extreme

rear of the deep stage, at the end of which a cross-table was placed for the presiding officer and others. The arrangement of scenery was such as to increase almost indefinitely the apparent depth of the stage, greatly heightening the effect of the brilliant scene.

An elaborate and bountiful repast was served, after grace had been said by Dr. Lothrop. A. A. Low, Esq., presided. Thanks were returned by Rev. A. D. Mayo. The presiding officer then made a brief speech; after which, at a call from the Chair, the following gentlemen responded: Dr. Bellows, Dr. Ellis, Mr. Stebbins of Portland, Dr. Briggs of Salem, Mr. Frothingham, Dr. Lothrop, Mr. Fuller, Mr. Brigham, and Dr. Osgood. The speeches were generally brief, bright, pointed, and effective. Dr. Bellows talked about the doings of Mr. King at San Francisco; reading extracts from letters to show how largely the munificent donations from the Golden City are due to his eloquent lips and earnest heart and active hand. He also talked pleasantly of the Sanitary Commission and its beneficent work; admitting the justice of the complaints of its shortcomings in some particulars, but explaining the inevitableness of more or less waste of stores, and loss of time in applying its bounties, as a necessity of the case, which no foresight, sagacity, or faithfulness, could obviate. War, of itself, is such a gigantic evil, that the utmost human power can only hope to mitigate its immediate results of suffering and sorrow, not to annul them, while the cause remains in full force. As to the friction in machinery, the waste or misapplication of supplies, a certain per cent must be expected, and allowed for. Instead of this being a reason why we should not do for the Commission, it is the very reason we should do more; just as the farmer plants, not less, but more, corn, because the crows steal one-fifth or two-fifths of his seed.

Dr. Ellis, after a few general remarks, alluded to Dr. Bellows's address of the morning, taking exceptions to his remarks about Southern character. He thought no amount of the graces or amenities of social life could atone for wholesale and individual *perjury;* that the chivalry of which we hear so much, and which used to be a *synonyme* for honor, had become a *substitute* for it. As to the "grace and fascination of Washington," he could call to mind three places, where, in the course of his life, he had found himself, in which he seemed to have wittingly and with full knowledge placed himself outside of God's providence, — where he felt he had no right even to pray. The first of these was in the crater of Vesuvius, where the hissing vapors and red-hot stones left him no alternative but to run away as fast as he could; the second was in the Mammoth Cave of Kentucky, nine miles under ground; and the third was in *Washington, under Buchanan's rule.* (This climax produced a perfect tempest of applause.) Mr. Stebbins of Portland next responded to the call of the chairman, and was followed by Dr. Lothrop of Boston, and Dr. Briggs of Salem, all of whom entered into the spirit of the occasion, and made telling speeches. Mr. Frothingham, of New York, next responded. His speech was, in part, a defence of the Northern democracy against the Southern aristocracy; the former, and not the latter, having proved, in and by this great struggle for supremacy, their true nobility. He illustrated this by a few pertinent facts from the history of the contest. Rev. A. B. Fuller gave some account of his experience in camp as chaplain. Mr. Brigham, of Taunton, good-naturedly controverted Dr. Osgood's estimate of Generals Banks and Butler as the two most efficient men Massachusetts had developed in this contest, and indicated Gov. Andrew and Senator Sumner as the foremost. He alluded to our duty as a

denomination to meet the demand from camp and hospital for reading-matter. The tracts we have already published have been gratefully received and usefully distributed. Their popularity, and the acceptableness of at least one of them (Mr. Ware's "Home to the Hospital"), is shown in the fact, that the Tract Society have asked permission to distribute it at their own cost.

Dr. Osgood next responded, happily and pleasantly, to the call of the chairman; and was followed by Dr. Bellows, who replied to the critics who had taken exceptions to some of his views, that he believed his sketches of Southern character to be just; and he had considered it important that the present popular disposition to deny the rebels the possession of any of the virtues or decencies of life should be withstood. If the secessionists are the miserable, God-forsaken wretches they are represented, no patriot could fight for a re-union with them.

The entertainment closed, the audience adjourned to the Church of the Messiah for vespers.

VESPERS.

This service, if we must criticise, seemed less soothing and elevating than that at the chapel. The explanation lies partially in the peculiar adaptability of the latter edifice to the service, but more in the excess of brilliant execution, over a devotional rendering, of the hymns, chants, &c., on the part of the choir. The pulpit-exercises were unexceptionable.

MR. COLLYER'S SERMON.

At the close of vespers, Rev. Robert Collyer preached a sermon from the text in Matt. xii. 24: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground, and die, it abideth alone; but, if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

The idea of the discourse, so far as it can be thus briefly summed up, was, that present sacrifice and loss are the doors through which God's blessings come to us. It is not by hoarding and saving up, but by use and using up, that our store expands.

The manner in which this important truth was unfolded, presented, and enforced, was unique. Mr. Collyer's strength is largely in the freshness and homely strength of his illustrations and speech. His is the talk of the street and the market; but through it runs a vein of poetry, like a silver thread. The discourse was listened to with profound interest.

THURSDAY MORNING.

Thursday morning, the conference-meeting was opened with prayer and remarks by Rev. Mr. Mayo, of Albany. He was followed by Messrs. Mumford, Fuller, Dr. Hill, and others.

At ten and a half o'clock, the Convention assembled; Dr. Farley in the chair. Rev. S. Longfellow opened the session with prayer. E. S. Mills, Esq., of Brooklyn, then read an able essay upon the preacher's part in the development of religious life and thought.

DISCUSSION.

The question for discussion was then named; viz., "What is the comparative value of preaching as a part of the church service?" The thoroughness of the discussion that followed, its exhaustive and forcible and every-sided statement, rendered this session decidedly the most interesting and profitable of the Convention.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM led off with a most brilliant defence of preaching, as the great power in, of, or outside of, the Church. Preaching is what the people want, crave, demand, need. They go to hear the great preachers,

wherever they hold forth; but then it must be real, live, earnest, nineteenth-century preaching, with the juice all in it. Preaching has ever been thus mighty. Paul was a *preacher.* It was the *preaching* of Peter the Hermit which stirred the crusades; the *preaching* of Luther, which precipitated the Reformation. Always it is *preaching* which stirs, rouses, elevates, kindles; raises a man out of his slough of indifferentism or selfish gratification, nearer to heaven. It is no use to offer a man, hungering, starving for bread, a stone, ecclesiastical or sacramental, telling him it is an ancient stone, a holy stone, which came from the sacred mountains; assuring him that certainly the holy winds swept over it, possibly the holy feet of prophets and apostles pressed it. "Yes," he replies: "it is certainly a precious and valuable stone; but *I can't eat it.*" It is bread, the bread of preaching, men want: with it, they grow; without it, they starve.

Dr. Osgood followed with a word of gratification at the able and forcible statement of one side of the case; but submitted that man has, at least, two sides to his nature. Besides the intellectual, which undeniably craves food, are the emotional and æsthetic, which no less demand sustenance, are more susceptible, more universally active, more readily and efficiently ministered to. The Church is recreant to her trusts and opportunities if she fails to employ the subtile and beneficent agencies of architecture, painting, music, poetry; to use her vantage-ground of antiquity, custom, and her cumulative wealth of religious sentiment and life. His presentation of this side of the case was masterly.

Mr. Mayo next took the floor. He assented to most that both his predecessors had said; admitted the need both of preaching and the sacraments, but only as a means. It is no use to stir men by appeals from the pul-

pit, to set their hearts aflame by great and noble outlooks of eternal truths, nor to elevate and enkindle them by sacramental rite or vesper-hymn, unless you direct this awakened and attuned energy to some practical end. Hence *organization*, the faculty of setting the pews to work, is to be cultivated by the pulpit as an essential and imperative need, if we would avoid a fatal pietistic dilettanteism.

Mr. COLLYER completed the quartet of sides to the question by his earnest and direct statement of what seemed to him a very essential part of the minister's duties; *i.e.*, the *pastoral*, — the binding-up of broken hearts and broken bodies by daily and hourly ministration; the proving of Sunday's message of God's fatherhood by exhibitions during the week of personal conviction of man's brotherhood; the six-days' practising, which not only fits the minister for the seventh day's preaching, but prepares the congregation to hear.

Mr. CONWAY agreed with the first speaker in the importance of preaching as the demand and the need of the age; and he illustrated its efficiency to do all that was claimed by the ritualistic or more purely devotional party by reference to a sermon he heard up-town, New York, the Sunday before. The service was held in a mean hall, wanting all the adornments of architecture, or embellishments of art; not even an organ to pour out its strains of devotion. But when the preacher, after a few preliminaries, began his sermon, and in the magnificent sweep of his argument, his reasoning, his clear and glowing statement, he gave utterance to his undying faith in the mortality of evil and the immortality of good, declaring that, "when the pit shall be ready for the fiend, he had no fear that the archangel would be wanting, to put him into it," the walls of that narrow room shot upward and out-

ward indefinitely, while from that wheezing, musical machine in the corner came strains of harmony such as no organ ever yielded to mortal touch, which swelled upward to the lofty nave and fretted aisles, and died upon the ear like the echoes of the millennium. Mr. Conway made a characteristic allusion to the *Episcopalian Convention* (whose long and stormy session was getting to be a by-word), designating it as *their winter lingering in the lap of our spring.*

Dr. HILL of Worcester referred to the fact, that, in England, the great cry is, not *less* preaching, but *more.* It is the preaching which *attracts* the multitude; but it must be more than mere intellectual entertainment, if it would hold and bless them.

The Chairman here expressed the strong desire he felt, and believed was shared by all present, to hear from Dr. GANNETT, who he noticed was present. The doctor promptly responded. He had little sympathy with yesterday's discussion; but in the present question he had great interest, and on it he had very decided views and opinions. He considered the pulpit to be the great power, the great pillar, the wall of defence, and hope of the nation; and from this he launched into a most eloquent, electrifying, stirring address upon the *preacher's* office, duties, claims, and needs. No pen or memory could follow his words; but the vigor, earnestness, persuasiveness, and wisdom of his utterances will not soon be forgotten by those who heard them.

Rev. JOHN PIERPONT came next. He considered the pulpit as just emerging from prison and chains under the influences of the present march of events. This was one of the inestimable blessings of this contest, that the great powers of the pulpit are to be unshackled. He alluded to a remark which fell from one of the speakers at yesterday's

collation, to the purpose that he (the speaker) never saw any special reformer, — a temperance man or an anti-slavery man or a woman's-rights man, — without the feeling that he must be a little unwell. "I could not help thinking," said Mr. Pierpont, "how sick some of us must be. When I entered Washington," he continued, "after resigning my chaplaincy, almost the first sight which met my eye on Pennsylvania Avenue was a squad of United-States soldiers, — two sober ones holding up one drunken one; and I felt 'a little unwell' then." It seemed at once an index to our military condition, and an explanation of our dilemma. With two hundred thousand sober soldiers taking care of one hundred thousand drunken ones, the remainder of the army could be expected to do little more than protect the capital.

At the conclusion of Mr. Pierpont's remarks, the thanks of the Convention were tendered our Brooklyn friends for their unwearying kindness and hospitality. The subjoined resolutions were unanimously adopted; after which, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered by Rev. Dr. Osgood, and the Convention dispersed.

RESOLUTIONS.

(1.) By Rev. CHARLES H. BRIGHAM, —

"*Resolved*, That the gratitude of every American heart is due to Count Agénor de Gasparin, whose efforts to direct aright the opinions and sympathies of the people of France and Europe in this great trial of America have so fully justified his fame as a defender of liberty, and illustrated so nobly the hereditary honor of his name."

(2.) By Rev. C. H. DALL, —

"*Resolved*, That the hearts of American Unitarian Christians, as represented by this our Autumnal Convention, beat in earnest

sympathy with all the brethren of our common faith in England, Scotland, and Ireland, — and we believe they are many, — who rejoice in our social, ecclesiastical, and national motto of universal liberty, holiness, love."

(3.) By Rev. Horatio Stebbins, —

"*Resolved*, That we support the President of the United States with our hands and with our prayers."

In the evening, such of the clergy and delegates as remained in town were elegantly entertained at the mansion of Abbott A. Low, Esq.; and, on the morrow, the last guests departed, with no shadow of doubt on their minds, it is safe to say, that this Convention was a not only brilliant success, but such a season of refreshment, stimulation, and enlightenment, as would have cheered, encouraged, and strengthened any member of our communion who should have attended it. It is impossible that so much good seed as was here scattered broadcast shall fail of abundant harvest. We may confidently expect, as one result, that the next Convention will witness the assemblage of an increased number of delegates; thus promoting the growth of one of the most important elements of our denominational strength and efficiency, — unity of action.

It is with no mere denominational self-complacency, but with a very pardonable pride, that we contemplate the number of variously cultivated and scholarly men, men of genius and eloquence, included within the list of our clergy as here represented; and when it is remembered how many, of equal ability and acquirements, were detained at home, we may safely challenge the members of any communion, however wide its borders, to produce a like number of men of equal force, mark, and public influence.

Surely but one thing is needed to render Unitarian

Christianity such a power in this country, as nothing should withstand its liberalizing, broadening, humanizing, and elevating influence; and that is *organization*. And this, it seems to us, was the lesson of this Convention.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Sept. 29, 1862. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Emerson, Lincoln, Clarke, Brigham, Newell, Barrett, Hinckley, Winkley, Sawyer, Smith, and Fox.

This was a special meeting appointed to hear the Report of the Committee on the India Mission, on the subject referred to them Sept. 15. They reported that they had conferred, as instructed, with Mr. Dall, and were prepared to recommend, that, in view of his long and faithful services in India as missionary of the Association, he be allowed a vacation, with permission to remain in this country, until the 1st of next April, — his salary to be continued during this time; and, further, that the whole subject of the mission be referred to a Committee, who should give it full and thorough consideration, and report to the Board at some future meeting.

This report was unanimously adopted; and the further consideration of the subject was referred to the same Committee, to which the President (Rev. Dr. Stebbins) and Mr. Emerson were added.

The Secretary presented for the consideration of the Board the question of issuing a "Year-book" for the coming year; and, after some discussion, the whole matter was referred to the Committee on Publications.

The Board then adjourned to Monday, Oct. 13.

Oct. 13, 1862. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Emerson, Lincoln, Brigham, Newell, Barrett, Hinckley, Sawyer, Smith, and Fox.

The Treasurer, by request of the Board, made a statement of the amount of funds then in his hands; and some discussion followed concerning the best method of obtaining contributions the present year from societies. It was then voted to refer the whole subject to the Finance Committee, with instructions to prepare and send to the societies of the denomination a circular, conforming to the resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Association, held May, 1861.

The Committee on New-England Correspondence presented an application for aid from the society in Warwick, Mass. As it appeared that the questions agreed upon by the Board, in their vote of July 14, had not been answered, no appropriation was made; but the Secretary was directed to write to the society, asking the needed information.

In compliance with a request received from Rev. H. A. Philbrook, of St. Stevens, New Brunswick, it was voted to give to the "Christian Union" in that place a copy of each of the publications of the Association.

Other business was transacted; and then the Board adjourned to Monday, Nov. 10.

INTELLIGENCE.

The Annual Convention of the Sunday-School Society was held at Newburyport, Mass., in the Pleasant-street Church, on Wednesday and Thursday, Oct. 8 and 9. The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President,

Rev. Alonzo Hill, D.D., of Worcester. Vice-Presidents, Rev. William G. Eliot, D.D, of St. Louis, Mo.; Mr. J. N. Daniell, of Roxbury; and the Presidents of the County Societies in Massachusetts. Secretary, Mr. Joseph H. Allen, of Boston. Treasurer, Mr. George W. Fox, of Boston. Directors, Hon. Frederic W. Lincoln, jun., of Boston; Henry Bigelow, M.D., of Newton Corner; Rev. Nathaniel Hall, of Dorchester; Rev. John M. Marsters, of North Cambridge; Rev. A. P. Putnam, of Roxbury; and Mr. Francis Brown, of Boston. The discussion on Wednesday was on the question, "Is the Sunday-school Concert an important aid to the Sunday School?" and was introduced by an address from Rev. Charles Lowe, of Somerville. In the evening, a sermon was delivered before the Convention by Rev. James Freeman Clarke, of Boston; after which there was a collation, prepared by the ladies of the Pleasant-street Society, in the City Hall. The exercises of Thursday commenced with a prayer-meeting at eight o'clock, which continued for an hour; and was followed by a debate on the question, "In interpreting the Bible, is it best for the teacher to express existing doubts?" which was introduced by an essay from Rev. John C. Kimball, of Beverly.

Mr. A. W. Stevens, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School in the class of the present year, has received and accepted a call from the society in Manchester, N.H.

Rev. John C. Kimball, of Beverly, has been appointed chaplain of the Eighth Massachusetts Regiment.

Rev. Edwin M. Wheelock, of Dover, N.H., has been appointed chaplain of the Fifteenth New-Hampshire Regiment.

Prof. Henry C. Badger, late of Antioch College, has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in East Cambridge, Mass., for one year.

Rev. Rushton D. Burr, having supplied the pulpit of the society in Uxbridge, Mass., for a period of six months, has received and accepted an invitation to become their pastor.

Mr. Jefferson M. Fox, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School in the class of 1861, was ordained as pastor of

the society in Trenton, N.Y., on Tuesday, Oct. 7. The order of services was as follows: Voluntary; prayer, and reading of the Scriptures, by Rev. William H. Fish, of Vernon; hymn; sermon, by Rev. George W. Hosmer, D.D., of Buffalo; ordaining prayer, by Rev. J. B. Peirce, of Trenton; charge, by Rev. Samuel J. May, of Syracuse; hymn; right hand of fellowship, and address to the people, by Rev. Edgar Buckingham, of Troy; concluding prayer, by Rev. S. J. May; benediction, by the pastor.

Mr. George L. Chaney, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School in the class of the present year, was ordained as pastor of the Hollis-street Society, Boston, on Sunday evening, Oct. 5. The sermon was preached by Rev. Frederic H. Hedge, D.D., of Brookline; Rev. William Newell, D.D., of Cambridge, offered the ordaining prayer; the charge was given by Rev. Edward E. Hale, of Boston; and the right hand of fellowship, by Rev. Henry W. Foote, of Boston.

Mr. William L. Chaffin, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School in the class of the present year, was ordained as pastor of the Second Unitarian Society in Philadelphia, Penn., on Friday, Oct. 17. The sermon was preached by Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D.D., of New York, who also gave the right hand of fellowship; Rev. William H. Furness, D.D., of Philadelphia, offered the ordaining prayer; the charge was given by Rev. Samuel K. Lothrop, D.D., of Boston; and the address to the people, by Rev. Nahor A. Staples, of Brooklyn, N.Y.

Rev. John M. Marsters, of North Cambridge, has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in Dover, Mass.

Rev. William H. Fish, formerly of Cortland, N.Y., has removed to Vernon, N.Y.; having accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in that place.

Rev. John F. Moors, of Greeenfield, Mass., has been appointed chaplain of the Fifty-second Massachusetts Regiment. During his absence, Rev. Thomas J. Mumford will supply the pulpit of the Greenfield Society.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

The Patience of Hope, by the author of "A Present Heaven;" with an Introduction by JOHN G. WHITTIER. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1862.

Any book recommended by Whittier must be deserving of attention. This one belongs to a class of which few books are to be found. It is curious, that, while works on *theology* are innumerable, books on *religion* are very few. This is a religious book in the best sense.

Country Living and Country Thinking. By GAIL HAMILTON. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

This book of essays seems to us much less artificial and much more substantial than the books of the Country Parson. The Country Parson never forgets himself, and is always attitudinizing before you. Gail Hamilton writes strongly and plainly, and we like (her) him.

Lectures on Moral Science. Delivered before the Lowell Institute, Boston. By MARK HOPKINS, D.D., LL.D., President of Williams College, author of "Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59, Washington Street, 1862.

Eyes and Ears. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1862.

The Poems of O. W. HOLMES. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1862. [Blue and gold.]

La Storia di Girolamo Savonarola e de suoi Tempi. Narrata da PASQUALE VILLARI, con l' Aiuto di Nuovi Documenti. Volume primo e secundo. Firenze: 1859.

Le Cento e Dieci divine Considerazioni del GIOVANNI VALDESSO. Halle in Sassonia: 1860. Translated from Spanish into Italian by EDWARD BOEHMER, of the University of Halle.

A copy of this book has been sent by Prof. Boehmer to the American Unitarian Association.

We have read all of WENDELL HOLMES'S poems in blue and gold; and it is a great pleasure to possess them in this compact form, — one hundred and forty-four in all.

Dr. HOPKINS's Lectures on Moral Science, delivered before the Lowell Institute in 1861, are here reprinted. We have not yet read them, and therefore cannot, as yet, notice them further than to say, that any work by Dr. Hopkins deserves the attention of all scholars.

"Eyes and Ears," by H. W. BEECHER, is a reprint, in handsome and readable form, of some of the best and wittiest articles which have appeared from time to time in the "Independent" and "Ledger." Whoever read, at the time when they first appeared, the articles on "An Echo," on "Modern Conveniences and First-class Houses," on "The Dog Noble," on "Apple-pie," on "Driving Fast Horses Fast," &c., will be glad to possess them in this convenient form, to take up and read to the family circle in the evening, whenever the conversation flags.

The new life of SAVONAROLA, by VILLARI, is apparently a great improvement on those by Madden and Harwood in English, by Meier and Rudelbach in German, and even that of Perrens in French. Lives of Savonarola are becoming very frequent: but Villari's combines more accuracy in detail, and just conception of the great soul, than any we have before seen; and we have made Savonarola something of a speciality.

The "One Hundred and Ten Divine Considerations of JOHN VALDESSO" is a remarkable book. Valdesso was a Roman Catholic, with strong reformatory and Protestant tendencies; even going the length of Unitarianism, in the opinion of many. This book, having been long forgotten, is now published in Italian, by a German; with notes and notices also written in Italian, by the same German. We shall have a fuller account of this book and writer hereafter.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1862.			
Oct. 3.	From Society in Petersham, for Monthly Journal, additional		$5.00
„ 24.	„	Society in Groton, for Monthly Journals	50.00

ARMY FUND.

Oct. 3.	From a friend		$1.00
„ 6.	„	Society in West Dedham, additional	1.00
„ 9.	„	James Arnold, Esq.	40.00
„ 18.	„	a friend	10.00
„ „	„	Society in Westford, additional	6.47